

SEP 27 2006

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

**REMARKS**

This Reply is intended to be completely responsive to the final Office Action mailed July 27, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present Application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the Application.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate status identifier for each.

**Response to Amendment**

On pages 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the declaration filed on May 1, 2006 was "ineffective to overcome the Conrad reference." In particular, the Examiner indicated that "the declaration filed by Applicant failed to establish prior conception" or that "Applicant either (1) completed the invention by conducting an actual reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the reference or (2) was diligent in completing the invention from prior to the effective date of the reference until a subsequent reduction to practice (either actual or constructive)."

As detailed below, a second Declaration by the inventor pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 has been provided herewith. The second Declaration establishes that the subject matter set forth in Claims 1-30 of the present Application was conceived and actually reduced to practice in the United States prior to the effective date of Conrad et al. As such, Conrad et al. is not available as prior art against Claims 1-30 of the present Application.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

On pages 3-7 of the Office Action, Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,810,527) in view of Podowski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,524,272).

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Specifically, Applicant submits that Conrad et al. is not available as a prior art reference against the claims of the present Application.

A second Declaration by the inventor pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 has been provided herewith which provides evidence that the subject matter recited in Claims 1-30 was conceived and actually reduced to practice prior to the filing date of Conrad et al. Specifically, the second Declaration includes statements of fact establishing that the subject matter recited in Claims 1-30 was conceived and actually reduced to practice prior to September 27, 1999.

Exhibit A (11 pages) attached to the Declaration is a redacted copy of pages from a document establishing conception of the subject matter recited in Claims 1-30 prior to the September 27, 1999 filing date of Conrad et al. Exhibit A discloses the subject recited in Claims 1-30 of the present Application. Applicant respectfully submits that this document, in combination with the factual statements in the second Declaration, provide the facts necessary to establish conception of the subject matter recited in Claims 1-30 of the present Application.

Exhibit B (3 pages) attached to the Declaration is a redacted copy of pages from a document establishing actual reduction to practice of the subject matter recited in Claims 1-30 prior to the September 27, 1999 filing date of Conrad et al. Exhibit B shows that the subject matter recited in Claims 1-30 of the present Application actually existed and worked for its intended purpose prior to the effective date of Conrad et al. Applicant respectfully submits that this document, in combination with the factual statements in the second Declaration, provide the facts necessary to prove actual reduction to practice of the subject matter recited in Claims 1-30 of the present Application. The subject matter recited in Claims 1-30 of the present Application was actually reduced to practice because a model of a communication and video system (as claimed) was built and shown to work for its intended purpose.

Exhibits A and B are redacted to remove certain proprietary information and the actual dates of reduction to practice. The actual dates of reduction to practice are not necessary because the Declaration by the inventor states "Each of the dates deleted from Exhibits A and B is prior

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

to September 27, 1999," (the effective date of Conrad et al.). Referring to the MPEP, "[i]f the dates of the exhibits have been removed or blocked off, the matter of dates can be taken care of in the body of the oath or declaration . . . if the applicant or patent owner does not desire to disclose his or her actual dates, he or she may merely allege that the acts referred to occurred prior to a specified date" (See MPEP § 715.07, subsection "Establishment of Dates").

Accordingly, in view of the second Declaration, the rejections of Claims 1-30 should be withdrawn, because Conrad et al. is not available as prior art against such claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

\* \* \*

It is submitted that each outstanding objection and rejection to the Application has been overcome, and that the Application is in a condition for allowance. Applicant requests consideration and allowance of all pending Claims 1-30.

Further, Applicant respectfully puts the Patent Office and all others on notice that all arguments, representations, and/or amendments contained herein are only applicable to the present Application and should not be considered when evaluating any other patent or patent application including any patents or patent applications which claim priority to this patent application and/or any patents or patent applications to which priority is claimed by this patent application.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

MILW\_2095987.1

-10-

Application No. 09/493,472

SEP-27-2006 15:09

ROCKWELL COLLINS IP DEPT. RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER 319 295 8777 P.16

SEP 27 2006

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR063/KE

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 27, 2006

By Kyle Eppele

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.  
400 Collins Road, NE  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498  
Telephone: (319) 295-8280  
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777  
Customer No. 26383

Kyle Eppele  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,155

MILW\_2095967.1

-11-

Application No. 09/493,472